Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1 and 2, and replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1 and 2.

In FIG. 1, a legend designating the figure as "Prior Art" has been added.

In FIG. 2, a legend designating the figure as "Prior Art" has been added.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (2 pages)

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-23 were pending. Claims 1, 5, 9, 14, and 20 are independent. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 15-19, and 21-23 are amended. Claim 24 is added. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claim can be found at least at page 7, line 20 to page 8, line 12 of the specification. Reconsideration of the action mailed January 22, 2007, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jansen et al. "NIST Special Publication 800-19-Mobile Agent Security" ("Jansen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,601 ("Walsh"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 2-4, 6-8, 13, 15-18, and 21-23 as lacking antecedent basis. However, the objection to the claims is not that the claims include features without antecedent basis. Rather the Examiner states that the recitation of "the piece of code" in the objected to claims would be less ambiguous if changed to "the piece of code from the database". Applicant disagrees that there is any ambiguity in the claims. For example, "the piece of code" in claim 2 clearly refers to the "one or more pieces of code" recited in claim 1. However, Applicant has amended the claims where appropriate for clarity.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected over Jansen in view of Walsh. Claim 1 is directed to a security console that includes a security module that controls the security of a jumping application. The security module includes instructions to replace code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from the database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior.

The Examiner states that Jansen does not disclose replacing code from the jumping application, but that Walsh does at col. 4, lines 37-38 and col. 8, lines 32-36. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Walsh discloses a mobile agent system. The mobile agent (*e.g.,* a jumping application) moves from computer to computer. A mobile codebase travels with the agent providing a repository of code that facilitates operation of the agent. *See* col. 2, lines 17-20. Additionally, the agent can send requests to a home codebase for code that is needed for operation of the agent, but which is not found in the mobile codestore. *See* col. 2, lines 23-30; col. 4, lines 25-34. Thus, when additional code is required, the agent can request code from a remote location.

The first cited portion of Walsh, however, does not refer to the adding of code to the mobile agent, but instead describes an itinerary associated with the mobile application. In particular, col. 4, lines 37-38 discloses that the itinerary includes a list of destinations for the agent and methods to be executed at each destination. The cited section does not disclose or suggest replacing code from the mobile agent.

The Examiner also cites col. 8, lines 32-36, which is part of claim 20. The cited portion discloses that the mobile agent can retrieve code that is not present in the mobile codebase from the home codebase. The cited section, however, does not disclose or suggest replacing code that implements a first behavior, as required by claim 1. Instead, the cited portion of Walsh refers to obtaining code that is not present to begin with. Thus, no code is replaced by the operations disclosed by Walsh.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 stands rejected over Jansen in view of Walsh. Claim 5 is directed to a security console that includes replacing code from a jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from a database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 5 as well as claims 6-8, which depend from claim 5, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 stands rejected over Jansen in view of Walsh. Claim 9 is directed to a method that includes replacing code in a jumping application that implements the particular behavior with a piece of code that implements the particular behavior. For at least the same reasons as set

forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 as well as claims 10-13, which depend from claim 9 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 stands rejected over Jansen in view of Walsh. Claim 14 is directed to a jumping application security system that includes a security console that replaces code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from a database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior. For at least the same reasons as set forth in claim 1, claim 14 as well as claims 15-19, which depend from claim 14, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 stands rejected over Jansen in view of Walsh. Claim 20 is directed to a server that includes instructions that replaces code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from the database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior. For at least the same reasons as set forth in claim 1, claim 20 as well as claims 21-23, which depend from claim 21, are in condition for allowance.

New Claim

Claim 24 is added. Claim 24 is directed to a method that includes receiving a jumping application at a server during a jump from a first host to a second host. The method also includes replacing code in the jumping application that implements a particular behavior with a piece of code that implements the particular behavior in the jumping application so that the jumping application has the particular behavior when it is executed by the second host.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, neither Jansen nor Walsh disclose or suggest replacing code in a jumping application. Furthermore, neither Jansen nor Walsh disclose or suggest receiving a jumping application at a server during a jump form a first host to a second host.

Jansen discloses a mobile agent security system where the mobile application jumps from agent to agent. In particular, Jansen describes a mobile agent that hops directly between agent platforms (hosts) to carry out particular operations. *See* page 2, second paragraph; FIG. 1. Thus, the mobile agent jumps from peer to peer. Jansen does not disclose or suggest that the mobile application is received by a server between jumps.

Walsh discloses sending requests to a server for missing code, but does not disclose or suggest that the mobile application is received by a server between jumps. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

Please apply the $25 in excess claims fees to deposit account 06-1050. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2007   /Brian J. Gustafson/
                                                  Brian J. Gustafson
                                                  Reg. No. 52,978

Customer Number: 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50402149.doc